



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/688,066 | 10/17/2003 | Gregory Scott Clark | 215.1022.01 | 8137 |

22883 7590 09/11/2006

SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC
P.O. BOX 390013
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NEURAUTER, GEORGE C

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/688,066 | CLARK, GREGORY SCOTT | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | George C. Neurauter, Jr. | 2143 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/10/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-22 are currently presented and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 10 July 2006 was filed after the mailing date of the non-final rejection on 14 March 2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for

Art Unit: 2143

establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application

Publication 2003/0033517 A1 to Rutherglen et al in view of US

Patent 6 377 974 B1 to Feigenbaum.

Regarding claim 1, Rutherglen discloses a method of transferring a file to or from a server (referred to throughout the reference as a "database server") past a firewall, comprising the steps of:

accessing a web site ("application server"; paragraph 0032) behind the firewall, the web site having a web page including an applet, and the web site associated with the server; receiving the web page and the applet from the web site; (paragraph 0031)

sending the applet to an application at a file transfer gateway ("database proxy object"); and transferring the file between the file transfer gateway and the server through the firewall. (paragraphs 0020, 0030, 0038, and 0040)

Art Unit: 2143

Rutherglen does not expressly disclose interrupting the transferring of the file and restarting the transfer at some midpoint, however, Feigenbaum does disclose these limitations (column 1, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Feigenbaum discloses that restarting the transfer of a file from a midpoint avoids having to restarting the transfer of the file from the beginning after interruption (column 1, lines 32-37). In view of these specific advantages and that the references are directed to transferring files from a server, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor, which would lead one of ordinary skill to reasonably expect a successful combination of the teachings.

Regarding claim 2, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 1.

Rutherglen discloses herein the web site is at a collaboration manager separate from the server. (paragraphs 0031, specifically "In the example shown, the...system may include an application server 60 and a database server 62." (see also Figure 1) and paragraph 0105, specifically "In another

Art Unit: 2143

scenario, the database server and the application server are on separate physical machines...")

Regarding claim 4, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 1.

Rutherglen discloses wherein accessing the web site and receiving the web page and the applet are performed using a web browser. (paragraph 0030)

Regarding claim 5, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 4.

Rutherglen discloses wherein the web browser and the file transfer gateway are implemented on a client. (paragraphs 0030 and 0038)

Regarding claim 6, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 1.

Rutherglen discloses wherein the application at the file transfer gateway is a file transfer service implemented on a client or edgebox. (paragraph 0038)

Regarding claim 7, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 6.

Rutherglen discloses wherein transferring the file between the file transfer gateway and the server is performed over a virtual channel between the file transfer service at the file

Art Unit: 2143

transfer gateway and a file transfer adapter at the server.

(paragraphs 0038 and 0040)

Regarding claim 8, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 1.

Rutherglen discloses wherein the file is transferred in chunks. (paragraphs 0036 and 0037)

Regarding claim 9, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 8.

Rutherglen discloses wherein the chunks are transferred using a basic hypertext transport mechanism. (paragraphs 0036 and 0037)

Regarding claim 10, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 1.

Rutherglen discloses further comprising the step of encrypting, decrypting, or performing some other operation on the file before or after transferring the file. (paragraphs 0020, 0030, 0038, and 0040; see also Figures 3A and 3B)

Regarding claim 11, Rutherglen discloses a method of transferring a file to or from a server past a firewall, comprising the steps of:

authenticating access by a requestor to a web site behind the firewall, the web site having a web page including an applet, and the web site associated with the server; sending the

Art Unit: 2143

web page and the applet to the requestor; receiving a request from the requestor to transfer the file to or from the requestor; transferring the file between the file transfer gateway and the server through the firewall. (paragraphs 0008, 0020, 0030, 0031, 0038, and 0040)

Rutherglen does not expressly disclose interrupting the transferring of the file and restarting the transfer at some midpoint, however, Feigenbaum does disclose these limitations (column 1, lines 20-30).

Claim 11 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 11.

Rutherglen discloses wherein the requestor is a browser or edgebox. (paragraph 0030)

Claims 14-18 are also rejected since these claims recite substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 2 and 7-10 respectively.

Regarding claim 19, Rutherglen discloses a method of downloading a file from a server past a firewall, comprising the steps of:

registering with the server behind the firewall; polling the server for files to be downloaded; and downloading the file

Art Unit: 2143

from the server through the firewall over a virtual channel; wherein the file is transferred in chunks using a basic hypertext transport mechanism. (paragraphs 0036-0038, 0040, and 0082)

Rutherglen does not expressly disclose interrupting the transferring of the file and restarting the transfer at some midpoint, however, Feigenbaum does disclose these limitations (column 1, lines 20-30).

Claim 19 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 19.

Claim 20 is also rejected since claim 20 recites substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 10.

Claims 21 and 22 are also rejected since claims 21 and 22 recites substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 19 and 10 respectively.

1. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutherglen and Feigenbaum in view of "Java Applet Signing Guide" to Wilson.

Regarding claim 3, Rutherglen and Feigenbaum disclose a method as in claim 1.

Rutherglen discloses wherein a user accessing the web site is authorized prior to retrieval of the applet. (paragraph 0008, 0030, and 0036)

Art Unit: 2143

Rutherglen and Feigenbaum do not expressly disclose wherein the applet is signed, however, Wilson does disclose this limitation (page 5, first paragraph)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Wilson discloses that signing applets enables the user to determine whether the source of the applet can be trusted (page 5, first paragraph). In view of these specific advantages and that the references are directed to communicating information between a client and a server, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor, which would lead one of ordinary skill to reasonably expect a successful combination of the teachings.

Claim 13 is also rejected since claim 13 recites substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 3.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2143

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9AM to 5:30PM Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

gcn



JEFFREY PWU
PRIMARY EXAMINER